UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,223	09/28/2001	Chee How Lim	219.40230X00	3861

7590   04/28/2005

Edwin H. Taylor
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA   90025

EXAMINER
CHEN, TSE W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/965,223	LIM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tse Chen	2116	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 March 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 21, 2005 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims 1 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: "delay elements

located in the path of said reference clock" should be "delay elements located in the path of said

reference clock *signal*". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Re Claims 1-5, 9-13, 18-20

4.   Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sevalia et al., US Patent 6356122, hereinafter Sevalia, in view of Roiter, US Patent

5636249.

5.   In re claim 1, Sevalia discloses a timing circuit [fig.2; col.1, ll.65-66] comprising:

- At least one driving circuit [multiplexer] outputting an output signal [col.3, l.10; col.4, ll.31-32].

- A phase locked loop [conventional PLL] receiving a reference clock signal [ref clock from input pin] and a delayed feedback clock signal [feedback signal from multiplexer is delayed by DL2], and supplying an output clock signal [signal from post divider M] to said at least one driving circuit, said phase locked loop generating said output clock signal according to said received reference clock signal and delayed feedback clock signal [fig.2; col.1, ll.56-64].

- First and second delay elements [programmable delays DL1 and DL2] located in the path of said reference clock signal and the path of a feedback clock signal, respectively, said second delay element to delay the feedback clock signal [fig.2; col.3, ll.12-24, ll.30-39; DL2 configured to provide a delay in order to make said output signal meet a predetermined valid data timing requirement], to determine whether an edge of the delayed feedback clock signal is early or late with respect to an edge of the feedback clock signal [col.2, l.45 – col.3, l.2; difference between an edge of input feedback signal into DL2 and a corresponding edge of output delayed feedback signal from DL2 constitutes the delay to be adjusted in order to provide a predictable input-output delay], and to increase or decrease the delay of the feedback clock signal based on whether an edge of the delayed feedback clock signal is early or late with respect to an edge of the feedback clock signal [col.4, ll.37-49; control DL2 accordingly to provide a predictable input-output delay].

6.   Sevalia did not discuss the details of the delay elements.

7.   Roiter discloses a timing circuit [phase synchronization apparatus] comprising:

   • Delay elements [fig.2] to determine whether a rising edge of a signal [rds signal] is early

      or late with respect to a falling edge of a clock signal [bit rate clock] [fig.3; col.4, l.65 –

      col.5, l.29].

8.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Sevalia and Roiter before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the timing circuit

taught by Sevalia to include the teachings of Roiter [broad concept can be applied to all kinds of

signals in general], in order to obtain the timing circuit comprising delay elements to determine

whether a rising edge of the delayed feedback clock signal is early or late with respect to a

falling edge of the feedback clock signal, and to increase or decrease the delay of the feedback

clock signal based on whether the rising edge of the delayed feedback clock signal is early or late

with respect to the falling edge of the feedback clock signal. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to align the edges

of signals [Roiter: col.4, l.65 – col.5, l.29].

9.   As to claims 2 and 10, Sevalia discloses the delay elements [programmable delays DL1

and DL2] that are located only in the reference clock and feedback clock paths [fig.2].

10.   As to claims 3 and 11, Sevalia discloses the first and second delay elements that are self-

calibrating delay cells [col.4, ll.5-17, ll.39-40, l.50; one time programming of estimated delay

subsequently lets delay circuits to calibrate or tune accordingly to be in phase].

11.   As to claims 4, 12 and 19, Sevalia discloses the self-calibrating delay cells that calibrate

themselves to meet specified timing adjustment, granularity and/or range [col.3, ll.40-63; col.4,

ll.5-17, ll.39-40, l.50; transistors and other elements have rated performance specifications that are selected to be within a tolerable range for timing adjustment].

12.   As to claims 5, 13, and 20, Sevalia discloses the self-calibrating delay cells that use a digital compensation technique to reduce PVT variations [col.3, ll.52-59; col.4, ll.17-20, ll.45-54; configuration bits digitally set values to compensate for PVT variations, taking into account the PVT characteristics of the delay elements].

13.   In re claim 9, Sevalia and Roiter disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 1. In addition, Sevalia discloses an I/O circuit [col.1, ll.56-59] comprising:

- A transmitting device [fig.2] outputting at least one output signal [multiplexer outputs one signal], said transmitting device having:

  o At least one driving circuit [multiplexer], the number of driving circuits corresponding to the number of output signals [fig.2; col.3, l.10; col.4, ll.31-32].

- A receiving device [col.2, ll.19-25] receiving said at least one output signal from said transmitting device, the timing of said received at least one output signal meeting said predetermined valid timing requirement [col.4, ll.17-20; configuration set up for device to get in phase signals in order to operate correctly].

14.   In re claim 18, Sevalia discloses a method of transferring a signal from a transmitting device [fig.2] to a receiving device [col.2, ll.19-25; circuit of fig.2 transmits clock signal to the device that the configurations are set to ensure timing is in phase] comprising:

- Outputting said signal from said transmitting device using a driving circuit [multiplexer] [col.3, l.10; col.4, ll.31-32].

- Receiving a reference clock signal in said transmitting device [fig.2; ref clock from input pin].

- Generating an output clock signal according to said received reference clock signal and a delayed feedback clock signal in a phase locked loop [conventional PLL; col.1, ll.56-64].

- Providing a delay in a path of said reference clock signal and a path of said feedback clock signal [programmable delay DL1 and DL2], said delay being configured to make said at least one output signal meet a predetermined valid data timing requirement [col.3, ll.12-24, ll.30-39, l.64 -- col.4, l.27; output is in phase with input for data timing to be valid].

15.   Sevalia did not discuss the details of the delay elements.

16.   Roiter discloses a method comprising:

- Phase aligning a falling edge of a signal [bit rate clock] to a rising edge of another signal [rds signal] [fig.3; col.4, l.65 – col.5, l.29].

17.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sevalia and Roiter before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the timing circuit taught by Sevalia to include the teachings of Roiter, in order to obtain the method comprising providing a delay in a path of the reference clock signal and a path of the feedback clock signal, the delay phase-aligning a falling edge of the feedback clock signal to a rising edge of the delayed feedback clock signal to make said at least one output signal meet a predetermined valid data timing requirement. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to align the edges of signals [Roiter: col.4, l.65 – col.5, l.29].

Re Claims 6, 14

18.   Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevalia

and Roiter as applied to claims 5 and 13 above, and further in view of Hamza, U.S. Patent

5818270.

19.   Hamza was cited as prior art in the previous Office Action.

20.   In re claims 6 and 14, Sevalia and Roiter disclose every limitation of the claim as

discussed above in reference to claims 5 and 13. Sevalia and Roiter did not discuss utilizing a

multi-tap delay buffer to delay a clock signal.

21.   Hamza discloses a timing circuit [clock multiplier 10] that utilizes a multi-tap delay

buffer [logical multiplier 14] in the clock signal [waveform 13] path to delay the clock signal, the

amount of delay being controlled by selecting a tap of the multi-tap delay buffer [col.2, ll.41-60].

22.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Savalia, Roiter and Hamza before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the timing

circuit taught by Savalia and Roiter to include the multi-tap delay buffer as taught by Hamza, in

order to obtain the timing circuit wherein the digital compensation technique utilizes a multi-tap

delay buffer in the feedback clock signal path to delay the feedback clock signal with the amount

of delay being controlled by selecting a tap of the multi-tap delay buffer. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to contribute

to the reduction of power and PVT variations [particularly the temperature] [Hamza: col.1, ll.37-

39].

Re Claims 7-8, 15

23.   Claims 7-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevalia

and Roiter as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Byrn et al., U.S. Patent 5977837,

hereinafter Byrn.

24.   Byrn was cited as prior art in the previous Office Action.

25.   In re claims 7 and 15, Sevalia and Roiter disclose every limitation of the claim as

discussed above in reference to claim 1. Sevalia and Roiter did not discuss the timing circuit

comprising a plurality of driving circuits.

26.   Byrn discloses a timing circuit [phase selector circuit 200] comprising a plurality of

driving circuits [external frequency dividers 204, 206, and 208] and a phase locked loop [202]

providing an output clock signal [PLL out] to all of the plurality of driving circuits [fig.2; col.2,

ll.54-62].

27.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Savalia, Roiter and Byrn before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the timing

circuit taught by Sevalia and Roiter to include the plurality of driving circuits as taught by Byrn,

in order to obtain the timing circuit with the plurality of driving circuits for outputting a plurality

of clock signals. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a

combination as it provides a way to output a plurality of clock signals.

28.   As to claim 8, Byrn discloses the plurality of driving circuits that drive respective output

signals from an IC chip [CMOS microprocessor] [col.1, ll.15-18; external is relative to the

synchronization path].

Re Claims 16-17

29.   Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevalia and

Roiter as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Goldrian, U.S. Patent 5742798.

30.   Goldrian was cited as prior art in the previous Office Action.

31.   In re claim 16, Sevalia and Roiter disclose every limitation of the claim as discussed

above in reference to claim 9. Sevalia and Roiter did not disclose expressly the I/O circuit

operating with a bus.

32.   Goldrian discloses an I/O circuit [fig.2] wherein the transmitting device [clock generator

200] and the receiving device [chip-A 204] comprise IC chips and the output signals [201] are

driven on a bus [bus comprises of lines 201-203] between the IC chips [col.3, ll.27-54].

33.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Sevalia, Roiter and Goldrian before him at the time the invention was made, to use the IC chip-

bus setting as taught by Goldrian for the I/O circuit disclosed by Sevalia and Roiter as the setting

taught by Goldrian is suitable for use with the I/O circuit of Sevalia and Roiter. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to

increase processing efficiency [col.1, ll.14-28].

34.   As to claim 17, Goldrian discloses the transmitting device and the receiving device are

mounted at a distance from each other on a printed circuit board [col.1, l.11].

Response to Arguments

35.   Applicant's arguments filed March 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

36.   Applicant alleges that "there is no teaching or suggestion in Sevalia of the delay elements

increasing or decreasing the delay of the feedback clock signal based on whether an edge of the

delayed feedback clock signal is early or late with respect to an edge of the feedback clock

signal..." Examiner notes that the previous rejection was based on the claim limitation of "said

first and second delay elements to delay ...", which is rendered moot by the current rejection

based on the amended claim limitation of "said *second delay element* to delay..." In any case,

Sevalia's teachings [whether implemented as a phase locked loop or delay locked loop] is based

on configuring delay elements DL1 and DL2 to provide predictable input-output delays in order

to output a signal that meets a predetermined valid data timing requirement. Accordingly, the

difference between an edge of input feedback signal into a delay element and a corresponding

edge of output delayed feedback signal from the delay element constitutes the delay that is

increased or decreased in order to provide the predictable input-output delay.

37.   Applicant alleges that "the relationship between the RDS signal and the bit rate clock in

Roither is not that of the RDS signal being a delayed version of the bit rate clock". To simplify

the issue, Examiner has replaced all relevant rejections of the claim limitation with the previous

rejection of the similar claim limitation of claim 18. As discussed above, the essential concept of

Roither's teaching is the synchronization of signals in general based on the case of aligning the

rising edge of one signal to the falling edge of another signal [Roither: col.5, ll.25-29]. The issue

of whether one signal is a delayed version of another signal is irrelevant in this case as the

rejection is based on the combination of Sevalia and Roither [Sevalia teaches the delay matter].

38.   Applicant alleges that the combination of Sevalia and Roither renders "Roither

unsatisfactory for its intended purpose... Roither is trying [to] make the time it takes for the RDS

signal and the bit rate clock attain phase synchronization as small as possible... whereas Sevalia

teaches placing programmable delay blocks in the reference clock path or feedback clock path...

combining the delay blocks of Sevalia with the timing circuit of Roither would render Roither

unsatisfactory for its intended use". Examiner respectfully submits that Sevalia's delay blocks

are not intended to just delay, but are intended to produce a *predictable delay* based on the input

and output phases as discussed above. Therefore, one with ordinary skill motivated to attain the

predictable delay in the shortest possible time can incorporate Roither's teachings with Sevalia's

teachings without rendering Roither's intended use unsatisfactory [e.g., shortening the step of

synchronizing the relevant edges effectively shortens the time to produce the predictable delay].

39.   All other claims were not argued separately.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tse Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3672. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tse Chen
April 22, 2005

**LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**